Information Management
Self-Assessment
Mid-year FY97

Submitted by Nicholas Nagy
April 1997

Introduction

This report covers progress made during the first half of FY97 in strategic and tactical planning and on all measures in each information management (IM) program element:
• Information Architecture,
• Desktop Computing
• Records Management and
• Financial Management.

We continue to partner with our DOE IM counterparts to ensure that our planning and self-assessment activities are aligned with DOE organizational objectives. For FY97, we negotiated with DOE regarding the elements (listed above) that would be assessed in this year's Appendix F measures for Information Management.

In January, DOE (AL and LAAO) and the LANL Appendix F team met to discuss performance measures and gradients for each of the four elements. After some follow-up discussions, we were successful in developing performance measures that are acceptable to both DOE and LANL.

Performance Character-ization

Our mid-year assessment of the four program elements indicates that we are on target in meeting our FY97 goals. We continue to make progress toward meeting our performance objectives, criteria, and measures. A description of our Division-wide self-assessment is presented in Section 1.2 Self-Assessment Program, and brief self-assessments of each IM program element follow in Section 1.3.

1.1. IM Strategic and Tactical Planning

1.1. a. Planning Implementation

Criteria: Information Management practices will be guided by programmatically coordinated strategic and tactical planning.

Performance Measure: Exhibit evidence that the planning processes supports the Laboratory's mission.

Progress to Mid-Year FY97
FY97 marks the first full year of the implementation of the Integrated Management Process (IMP). The IMP builds on several previous years' planning efforts, whereby each major phase of activity–strategic planning, business planning, operations, and assessment–complements and reinforces the others in a continuous management system. Accomplishments to date are listed below.

• *Baseline assessment of IM activities against the Baldrige criteria.* Two assessments were performed: one by a representative team of customers and employees and the other by the IM leadership team. Results were used as one of the inputs to the strategic planning process. The customer/employee team has been kept informed as to how its input is being used. (See Section 1.2 for additional information on the Baldrige-criteria-based self-assessment.)

• *Redesign of the strategic planning process by a subteam of the IM leadership team.* In two workshop sessions, inputs such as white papers on the technology future, Baldrige review results, Appendix F self-assessment results, and customer feedback were used to formulate strategic and tactical goals for FY98 - FY00. The strategic/tactical plan has been published on the Web and communicated to employees through component organization meetings. An all-IM employees' forum and a special article on this topic in the May issue of our *BITS: Computing & Communications News* are planned. Two strategic goals emphasize the IMP:

one relates to the continuation of the development and implementation of the IMP at the Division and component organization levels (group, project, and center); the other relates to beginning to implement process management at the component organization level.

• *Redesign of the business planning process by a subteam of the IM leadership team.* The redesign places stewardship for strategic and tactical goals with focus teams, introduces reporting against strategic and tactical goals into the progress reporting mechanism, and ensures linkages between strategic and tactical goals and operations. Implementation of the redesigned process is in progress with peer reviews of the FY98 business plans targeted for May 14-15.

• *Continuation of quarterly operations progress reporting for all IM component organizations.* Accomplishments, schedule changes, issues, performance metrics results, and financial position continue to be reported quarterly, with one-third of the organizations reporting each month.

• *Development of an initial assessment process will be undertaken during the summer.* It will include assessment of the strategic planning, business planning, and operations processes; a roll-up of assessments at the component organization (group?)level; and continuation of reviews against the Baldrige criteria.

As a result of the strategic planning process, the Management and Operations Focus Team has been appointed steward of the IMP, replacing the Core Team. Throughout the year, this focus team coordinates IMP activities, assesses processes, and charters improvements.

1.2. **IM Self-Assessment Program**
1 . 2a. Self-Assessment Program Development

Criteria: Maintain a self-assessment program that evaluates the effectiveness of management and operational practices.

Performance Measure: Demonstrate that self-assessments are taking place and that corrective actions, where necessary, are accomplished in a timely and effective manner.

The Laboratory's IM self-assessment program is fully integrated with Computing Information, and Communications (CIC) Division's automated business planning system. The self-assessment results are reported on a regular basis and are based on data collected through the business processes of the groups. In our effort to support the ongoing partnering with DOE, both DOE and Laboratory audit staff have access to the planning and self-assessment information, and they have been attending quarterly business-plan meetings.

Baldrige-Based Self-Assessment
As input into CIC Division's FY98 Strategic Plan, CIC conducted an internal assessment based on the Malcolm Baldrige criteria. Using the Baldrige criteria provided the following benefits:
- a fact-based review of the Division as a complete entity,
- a systematic method for identifying key areas for improvement,
- comparison of CIC Division with typical and world-class performance,
- a consistent method for year-to-year comparisons, and
- a comprehensive framework of how well-managed businesses operate.

We gathered input from 45 customers and employees and from the CIC leadership team (group and project leaders and Division management staff). Participants were assigned to one of the seven Baldrige categories and trained in the criteria as well as in examination and assessment skills. Two assessments were done: (1) by the customer-employee group and

(2) by the leadership team. Results from both assessments were combined, and the top four strengths and areas for improvement were used as input into the strategic plan. All scheduled milestones during the project were met.

Customer Satisfaction Determination

One of the outcomes of the Baldrige-based self-assessment was the formation of a new focus team to address customer relations at a Division level. The charter of the Customer Relations Focus Team is to serve as the focal point for researching and developing consistent methods to promote effective customer relationships. The associated tactical goals are to

- Profile current and potential customers.
- Identify and document current customer interaction processes.
- Develop and implement consistent models for customer interactions across the Division.
- Promote customer involvement throughout the entire product/service life cycle.

The focus team is now testing a matrix of Division products/services and customers, and the team plans to roll out and expand the matrix to the entire leadership team in May. The team has also begun developing a survey tool to use within the Division to gather and document current customer-interaction processes throughout the Division.

A long-term goal of the focus team is to be able to survey all CIC customers with a Division-wide tool rather than having multiple and sometimes overlapping surveys performed by individual groups or projects. Until that time, groups and projects continue to gain valuable customer satisfaction data with a wide variety of Web-based and point-of-service surveys.

OIG Finding

This self-assessment also addresses a finding by the Office of the Inspector General (OIG). The finding addressed inappropriate management of computer maintenance. According to the OIG report, Los Alamos was not acquiring computer equipment maintenance in the most effective, efficient, and economical manner. Maintenance contracts included equipment that had been officially retired, and Los Alamos users were charged for in-house maintenance of microcomputers for equipment still under vendors' warranty. The finding was addressed by the appropriate management levels at the Laboratory to ensure that audit recommendations were satisfactorily addressed. The issue was resolved, and Los Alamos has been in contact with DOE/AL on a regular basis regarding our response to this audit finding. In FY97, this finding will be tracked through the business planning process. Additional information will be provided in the year-end IM Appendix F report.

1.3 Customer-Focused Information Management
1.3a. Level of Customer Satisfaction

Criteria: The information management program provides cost-effective quality products and services that meet customer requirements.

Performance Measure: Conduct annual reviews of the results of customer satisfaction activities, compare results with previous reviews, trend customer satisfaction, and implement activities toward improvement.

Information Architecture (IA)
The IA Project is preparing a survey to measure the use of desktop standards. We expect the survey to go out in May or June so that we can have the results ready by early August for the year-end IM Appendix F report.

Desktop
The 1997 CIC-2 customer survey is being prepared and will be deployed via the Web in April 1997. A formal presentation has been made to the CIC-2 Customer Advisory Board, and customer feedback from that advisory board is being collected.

Financial Management
The financial team is plotting last year's survey as a baseline and is ready to distribute its 1997 quarterly survey. This first survey will cover 1st and 2nd quarters; subsequent surveys will be quarterly.

In addition to these, work is progressing on several other surveys that will be reported in our final Appendix F report:
CIC-1, 9, and 14 Web-based and point-of-service surveys;
CIC-5, 7, 11, and External Computing Web-based survey covering all HPCC products and services; and
CIC-13 focus group meetings in conjunction with BUS Division.

1.3b. Evidence of Performance Measure: Provide evidence of measurable improvements.
Measurable   (See following pages for tables of the objective(s), measure, expectation, and weight for
Improvements   each IM element.)

Information Management Element #1: **Information Architecture**

Assumption: Narrative description of the project and accomplishments towards the definition of the infrastructure requirements. The Laboratory will conduct a study of how the electronic workplace contributes to information sharing and in making progress towards satisfying issues identified in the study.

Objective	Measure	Expectation	Weight
1.a. Conduct a study to create an electronic workplace on the Web.	Study is used to identify a prototype project.	**Far Exceeds**: Study is conducted, analysis completed, and issues are being addressed. **Exceeds**: Study is conducted, analysis completed, and issues identified. **Meets**: Study is conducted. **Needs Improvement**: Study is not conducted.	Will be equally weighted with other elements in 1.3b.

Description of Electronic Workplace Study: We have formed a team of six employees working on the study half-time for a period of three to four months. This team of experts, representing networking, Internet/Web, security, electronic messaging, Lab-wide systems, and automated routing and approval, has been charged with understanding and determining the feasibility of an electronic workplace at the Laboratory. Their product will be a set of requests for comment and an implementation plan recommending the pace and resources necessary for the prescribed capabilities.

The team has been considering what is available from the major electronic workplace vendors, including Lotus, Netscape, and Microsoft. We believe that being early adopters of commercial products is the correct strategy. We also believe that the Lab should develop an infrastructure to support the underlying standards for the electronic workplace. This will focus our efforts on interoperability, enabling us to support more than a single vendor for these products.

Information Management Element #2: **Desktop Computing**

Assumption: Narrative description of the support cost per desktop system. This cost will be compared with industry standard metrics from the Gartner Group (the gradients for this metric are based upon Gartner Group data indicating that $1,125 per desktop per year is the benchmark for best industry practice.

Objective	Measure	Expectation	Weight
2.a. Increase cost savings.	Support costs per desktop computer (in dollars).	**Far Exceeds**: $\leq$ $1,125 **Exceeds**: < $1,700 **Meets**: < $2,250 **Needs Improvement**: > $2,250	Will be equally weighted with other elements in 1.3b.

During the period from 10/1/96 to 3/27/97, the average number of desktops supported per CIC-2 technician was 71, resulting in an average cost per desktop of $1588 per year. Only 14% of the CIC-2 support contracts have reported this metric.

Assumption: Narrative description of how cost savings were achieved through smart licensing in the areas of: 1) site licenses, and 2) bulk procurements.

Objective	Measure	Expectation	Weight
2.b. Increase cost savings.	Savings from software electronically distributed.	**Far Exceeds**: >$3 M **Exceeds**: $1.5M–$3M **Meets**: $500k–$1.5M **Needs Improvement**: < $500k	Will be equally weighted with other elements in 1.3b.

Software cost savings from 10/1/96 to 3/27/97: Netscape $223k, Eudora $135k, Microsoft $107k, others $9k, for a total of $474k. The Microsoft contract had only been in place for 3 weeks during this reporting period. No data have yet been collected for SunSoft or for Apple.

Information Management Element #3: **Records Management**

Assumption: The goal is to inventory records held prior to October 1, 1997. LANL will provide a plan describing the total records holdings, the methodology for determining the holdings, the milestones and costs associated with completing the records inventory.

Objective	Measure	Expectation	Weight
3.b. Complete the records inventory mandate for records held prior to October 1, 1997.	In FY97, submit to DOE/ALO a plan for completing the records inventory including milestones, goals, and costs.	**Far Exceeds**: Records Inventory Plan prepared and approved by CIC management and submitted for approval to DOE/ALO by 6/30/97. **Exceeds**: Records Inventory Plan prepared and approved by CIC management and submitted for approval to DOE/ALO by 7/31/97. **Meets**: Records Inventory Plan prepared and approved by CIC management and submitted for approval to DOE/ALO by 8/29/97. **Needs Improvement**: Records Inventory Plan not submitted to DOE/ALO during FY97.	Will be equally weighted with other elements in 1.3b.

The Records Inventory team, under the leadership of Tommy Hook, project leader, has begun to compile the information on the resource requirements (funding, staff, etc.) needed to prepare a Records Inventory Plan to complete the Laboratory's records inventory. The plan will include annual deliverables based on the level of effort that would be funded to complete the inventory.

Assumption: Continue to make progress on the records inventory project.

Objective	Measure	Expectation	Weight
3.a. Complete a portion of the records inventory in FY97 based on projected direct funding from LANL customers.	Volume of records holdings inventoried.	**Far Exceeds**: Inventory >12,000 cubic feet of records **Exceeds**: Inventory >10,000 cubic feet of records **Meets**: Inventory >8,000 cubic feet of records **Needs Improvement**: Inventory < 8,000 cubic feet of records	Will be equally weighted with other elements in 1.3b.

Based on our current level of effort, which correlates to the amount of direct funding we have received from our customers, the CIC-10 Records Inventory team expects to meet our goal of inventorying 8,000 cu. ft. of records in FY97.

Information Management Element #4: **Financial Management**

Assumption: Narrative description of the budget process with identification of cost overrun/underrun, significant cost reductions or avoidance, and any creative and/or innovative approaches to attracting new funding.

Objective	Measure	Expectation	Weight
4.a. CIC budget will be on target when compared with actual revenues and allocations.	Percentage of overrun or underrun.	**Far Exceeds**: End of Year comparison to the revenues/allocations results in no more than 1% overrun or 5% underrun. **Exceeds**: No more than 3% overrun. **Meets**: No more than 5% overrun. **Needs Improvement**: More than a 5% overrun.	Will be equally weighted with other elements in 1.3b.

We track and analyze our financial performance monthly. We review not only each group's financial position, but also the Division as a whole. CIC's financial position as of the end of March is excellent with respect to our measures, specifically for CIC Division as a whole:
  -G&A spending is under budget by 3.4%.
  -Recharge, both institutional and direct taken together are 5.6% under budget.
  -Organizational Support is 8.9% under collected revenues.
  -Direct/Reimbursable spending is 3.7% under budget.

We do not combine these measures at this time because our spending throughout the year is not uniform. However, CIC is definitely headed toward compliance with our financial objective.